

ED 314 538

UD 027 218

AUTHOR O'Hare, William P.
 TITLE Assimilation and Socioeconomic Advancement of
 Hispanics in the U.S. Staff Working Paper.
 INSTITUTION Population Reference Bureau, Inc., Washington,
 D.C.
 PUB DATE Apr 89
 NOTE 84p.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical
 Data (110)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation; Adjustment (to Environment);
 Demography; *Economic Opportunities; *Family
 Financial Resources; *Hispanic Americans; Immigrants;
 Minority Groups; Social Indicators; Social
 Integration; Social Stratification; *Socioeconomic
 Influences; *Socioeconomic Status

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an overview of the socioeconomic status and advancement of the Hispanic population in the United States. The study uses both socioeconomic indicators and noneconomic measures to assess the level of Hispanic assimilation, and analyzes the influence of subgroup affiliation, place of birth, and length of time since immigration on socioeconomic stratification. The paper is comprised of seven sections. Section 1, "Introduction," discusses theoretical and methodological considerations and presents a demographic overview of Hispanic Americans. Section 2, "Income and Earnings of Hispanics," finds greater declines in family income and individual earnings for Hispanics than for Whites or Blacks during the 1980s. Section 3, "Poverty and Welfare Use Among Hispanics," indicates increases in the poverty rate and number of welfare recipients. Section 4, "Education," reports increases in Hispanic educational attainment in the 1980s but a persistent lag behind that of Whites. Section 5, "Homeownership," finds Hispanics less likely than Blacks or Whites to own homes in 1986. Section 6, "Occupation and Labor Force Participation," examines trends in employment and unemployment. Section 7, "Other Measures of Assimilation and Integration," uses the following measures to analyze Hispanic assimilation: (1) English language usage; (2) residential integration; (3) intermarriage; and (4) fertility. Statistical data are presented on 29 tables. (AF)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

1/2/90

ED314538

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect the special points of view.

Population Reference Bureau

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

□ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Worrall

Population Reference
Bureau, Inc.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

Assimilation and Socioeconomic Advancement of Hispanics in the U.S.

by
Dr. William P. O'Hare

Staff Working Papers

April 1989

ED 027 218

Assimilation and Socioeconomic Advancement of
Hispanics in the U.S.
by
The Population Reference Bureau, Inc.

April, 1989

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper provides a broad overview of the current socioeconomic status and the recent socioeconomic advancement of the rapidly growing Hispanic population. Several non-economic measures are also examined to assess the level of assimilation of this group.

In attempting to portray the socioeconomic status of Hispanics in the U.S., the paper draws on nine key indicators:

- o income;
- o earnings;
- o poverty;
- o welfare use;
- o education;
- o occupation;
- o labor force participation;
- o unemployment;
- o homeownership;

While several of these measures are highly inter-related they are treated individually in the paper because they underscore several separate dimensions of socioeconomic status. In addition to examining the situation of the entire Hispanic population with respect to each of the nine key socioeconomic variables an attempt is made to analyze how underlying factors contribute to the overall trend. Specifically, it has been hypothesized that factors such as the subgroup affiliation of Hispanics (i.e., Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central and South American, Other Hispanic); the place of birth of Hispanics (i.e., native versus foreign born); and the length of time since immigration, are central to the stratification of the general Hispanic population along the socioeconomic spectrum.

With respect to median family income and individual earnings the major findings are:

- o In 1988, Hispanic family income was 63% that of whites but it 112% that of blacks.
- o During the 1980s both family income and individual earnings of Hispanics declined more than they declined for either whites or blacks.
- o Average income for all Hispanic subgroups declined in the 1980s.
- o In general native born Hispanics have higher incomes than foreign born Hispanics.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper provides a broad overview of the current socioeconomic status and the recent socioeconomic advancement of the rapidly growing Hispanic population. Several non-economic measures are also examined to assess the level of assimilation of this group.

In attempting to portray the socioeconomic status of Hispanics in the U.S., the paper draws on nine key indicators:

- o income;
- o earnings;
- o poverty;
- o welfare use;
- o education;
- o occupation;
- o labor force participation;
- o unemployment;
- o homeownership;

While several of these measures are highly inter-related they are treated individually in the paper because they underscore several separate dimensions of socioeconomic status. In addition to examining the situation of the entire Hispanic population with respect to each of the nine key socioeconomic variables an attempt is made to analyze how underlying factors contribute to the overall trend. Specifically, it has been hypothesized that factors such as the subgroup affiliation of Hispanics (i.e., Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central and South American, Other Hispanic); the place of birth of Hispanics (i.e., native versus foreign born); and the length of time since immigration, are central to the stratification of the general Hispanic population along the socioeconomic spectrum.

With respect to median family income and individual earnings the major findings are:

- o In 1988, Hispanic family income was 63% that of whites but it 112% that of blacks.
- o During the 1980s both family income and individual earnings of Hispanics declined more than they declined for either whites or blacks.
- o Average income for all Hispanic subgroups declined in the 1980s.
- o In general native born Hispanics have higher incomes than foreign born Hispanics.

- o Median family income is higher the longer the head of the Hispanic household has been in the country.

With respect to poverty and welfare use the major findings are:

- o The poverty rate for Hispanics was 2.7 times that of whites in 1987, and while it was not as high as the black poverty rate, the Hispanic rate increased more than the rates for whites and blacks in the 1980s.
- o The poverty rate increased for all Hispanic subgroups in the 1980s, though there is a considerable amount of variation in the rate of increase across subgroups.
- o Poverty rates for foreign-born Hispanics are generally higher than for U.S.-born Hispanics.
- o In 1980, poverty rates were lower among Hispanics who have been in the U.S. longer.
- o There was an increase in the number of Hispanics using welfare in the 1980s but this was due to an increase in the absolute number of Hispanics in poverty and not to an increase in the rate of welfare usage among Hispanics.
- o Hispanics' use of 5 major welfare programs was higher than for whites but not as high as for blacks.
- o The subsidized school lunch program is the only major welfare program that reaches a majority of poor Hispanics.

With respect to Hispanic educational attainment, the major findings are:

- o The average level of educational attainment of Hispanics increased in the 1980s, but still lags far behind that of whites.
- o Mexicans and Puerto Ricans have larger shares of their populations that do not have at least 12 years of education than Cubans and Other Hispanics.
- o Foreign-born Hispanics have a much lower level of educational attainment than native-born Hispanics.
- o In general, the level of education is higher among immigrants who have been in the U.S. longer.

With respect to labor force participation, unemployment and occupation the major findings are:

- o The labor force participation rate of Hispanic males stayed even at about 80% in the 1980s while that of Hispanic females increased slightly.
- o During the 1980s Puerto Ricans (males and females) had the lowest rate of labor force participation of any Hispanic subgroups.
- o In 1980, labor force participation rates were higher for immigrants than for U.S.-born Hispanics.
- o In 1980, the labor force participation rate was higher among those immigrants who have been in the U.S. longer.
- o In 1980, the unemployment rate for native-born Hispanics was slightly higher than for foreign-born Hispanics.
- o In 1980, foreign-born Hispanics who arrived in an earlier period had lower unemployment rates than those who arrived later.
- o In the 1980s, Hispanics experienced a small but steady increase in the percentage employed in white-collar occupations.

With respect to homeownership the major findings are:

- o In 1986, Hispanics were less likely than blacks or whites to be home owners.
- o Among Hispanic subgroups, Puerto Ricans have the lowest rate of homeownership while Cubans have the highest rate.

Four non-economic measures are examined in this paper to analyze the level of assimilation of Hispanics: English language usage, residential integration, intermarriage and fertility.

Data on English language usage are available on a nationwide basis from the 1980 Census and indicate that:

- o In 1980, 6% of Hispanics said they spoke no English and 37% said they did not speak English very well.
- o In 1980, 22% of Cubans but only 8% of Puerto Ricans said they did not speak English at all.
- o The percentage of Hispanics who speak no English is lower among those born in the U.S. than among those born outside the U.S.

With respect to intermarriage we found;

- o About one-sixth of married Hispanics have a non-Hispanic spouse.
- o The rate of intermarriage for Hispanics did not change significantly in the 1980s although the absolute number of Hispanics married to a non-Hispanic spouse increased 26%.
- o The rate of Hispanic intermarriage was several times that of blacks.

With respect to residential integration:

- o Hispanics trail far behind whites in the process of suburbanization, but are more advanced than blacks in this process.
- o In 1980, Hispanics live in less segregated neighborhoods than blacks, but over the 1970-1980 decade blacks experienced a greater decline in the degree of residential segregation than did Hispanics.

With respect to fertility:

- o Hispanic women in the 15-24 age group have family size expectations similar to Anglo women in the same age group, however, Hispanic women in their 30s have higher family size expectations than Anglo women in the same age group.
- o Completed fertility is higher among foreign-born Hispanic women than among native-born Hispanic women.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Theoretical and Methodological Considerations
Demographic Overview: Who are Hispanics?

2. Income and Earnings of Hispanics

Income
Earnings

3. Poverty and Welfare Use Among Hispanics

Poverty
Government Welfare Usage

4. Education

5. Homeownership

6. Occupation and Labor Force Participation

Labor Force Participation
Unemployment
Occupation

7. Other Measures of Assimilation and Integration

Language Usage
Fertility Norms
Residential Segregation
Intermarriage

Assimilation and Socioeconomic Advancement of Hispanics in the U.S.

Section 1 - Introduction

The image of America as a melting pot of different races and ethnic groups is an important component of our national identity and the successful assimilation of many past immigrant groups is a source of pride for many Americans. Most Americans would like to believe that our system allows immigrants and ethnic minorities to easily move into the mainstream of American culture.

For many European immigrant groups who arrived in this country during the 1800s or early in this century assimilation¹ is virtually complete. However, the assimilation experienced by today's fastest growing minority group, Hispanics, is uncertain.

In this paper we will look at some of the data regarding the assimilation and socioeconomic status of Hispanics. We will look at changes in the overall socioeconomic status of Hispanic groups in recent years. Data will also be examined to see if the sons and daughters of Hispanic immigrants have been able to move up the socioeconomic ladder and to what extent immigrants themselves experience socioeconomic

¹. Many different terms such as assimilation, acculturation, integration, and adaptation are used to describe the process by which immigrant groups join the broader U.S. society. In this paper we use these terms interchangeably.

advancement over time.

As you will see in this report, the story is complex and the results are mixed. Given the broad and complicated nature of the topic, we cannot hope to provide a detailed examination in the limited space of this report. Our aim is to provide a broad assessment of a few major points.

The term assimilation means different things to different people. Throughout most of this report we use the term to reflect socioeconomic parity. Use of the term in this way does not address the extent to which immigrants and minorities adopt the behavior and psychological norms of the major culture. The last section of the report addresses a few point regarding behavioral adaptation.

Studying the assimilation of Hispanics is particularly complex because it involves assessing the adoption of U.S. culture by immigrants as well as the social mobility of an American-born minority group.

The report draws on a large and growing number of research articles and reported data which shed light on this topic. In addition, original data analysis is undertaken to address some specific points that are not covered in the literature. To the extent possible the report focuses on changes that have occurred between 1980 and 1988, as the Hispanic population in the U.S. increased from 14.6 to 19.4 million. However, in many instances, the 1980 Census data is the most recent evidence available.

The long history of research on the assimilation of immigrants as produced a model of immigration and assimilation that is widely accepted. But, it is not clear how well past findings apply to the large numbers of Hispanics who have arrived in the U.S. in the past few decades.

The applicability of past immigration-adaptation models to today's Hispanics are being questioned for two major reasons. First, the immigrants of the past were primarily Europeans while the bulk of today's immigrants come from Latin America and Asia. European immigrants shared many cultural traits and physical characteristics with America's native-born Anglo population. Second, the old model of immigration/adaptation was linked to an economic structure that no longer exists. The U.S. economic base and occupational structure have changed rather dramatically in the past two decades and it is not clear what impact this will have on immigrant mobility.

While the adaptation of recent Hispanic immigrants is an important part of the story, Sullivan directs us to another important characteristic of Hispanics; minority status. "Hispanics share with blacks and other racial minority groups a history of de jure and de facto segregation".²

It is important to remember that many ancestors of

². Sullivan, 1985, "A demographic Portrait" in Hispanics in the U.S. eds. Cafferty and McCready, Transaction Press.

today's U.S. Hispanics were here before the Anglo settlers arrived on this continent.³ So even though recent immigration from Latin America is a prominent source of population growth for the Hispanic population, it is hardly fair to refer to all Hispanics as recent immigrants. This suggests that the appropriate comparison group for Hispanics may not be immigrant groups but rather other minority groups.

This perspective raises questions about the comparative well-being and assimilation of Hispanics and other minority groups such as blacks, Native Americans, and Asian-Americans. While the civil rights victories of the 1960s appeared to open up new opportunities for U.S. minorities, it is not clear that Hispanics have realized the benefits envisioned by the policy changes of the 1960s.

Understandably most ethnic groups are torn between a desire to become assimilated into U.S. society and a desire to retain their cultural identity. However, a recent poll⁴ indicates that 80 percent of Hispanics feel that Hispanics should become more assimilated into American culture. Therefore it is unlikely that lack of interest in assimilation is a major barrier for Hispanic groups.

Our study focuses on the assimilation of U.S. Hispanics in relation to three key variables; 1) subgroup affiliation

³. Galarza, E., Gallegos, H. and Samora, 1969, "Mexican-Americans in the Southwest", Santa Barbara, McNally and Loftin.

⁴. Hispanic Business, February 1989, page 60

(Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Central and South Americans, and Other Hispanic), 2) place of birth (foreign born versus U.S. born) and 3) time of immigration.

Portes and Truelove maintain that national origin is one of the most important ways of stratifying the Hispanic population. 'Nationality does not simply stand for different geographic places of birth; rather it serves as a codeword for the very distinct history of each major immigrant flow, a history which molded, in turn, its patterns of entry and adaptation to American society.⁵ To the extent that data allow it, we will explore subgroup differences throughout the report.

If native born Hispanics are better off than their foreign-born counterparts this suggests that sons and daughters of Hispanic immigrants are becoming assimilated into the U.S. culture. Where ever possible we examine differences among immigrants based on the length of time they have been in the U.S., which most analysts maintain is a crucial variable in research on Hispanics.⁶ If the evidence indicates that Hispanic immigrants are able to move up the socioeconomic ladder over time, the current low status of U.S. Hispanics may be a product of the large numbers of new

5. Portes and Truelove, 1987, "Making Sense of Diversity: Recent Research on Hispanic Minorities in the United States", Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 13.

6. Sullivan, 1985, "A Demographic Portrait", in Hispanics in the US eds. Cafferty and McCready, Trausuchain Press.

immigrants rather than a static condition.

Among those Hispanics who have entered the country since the end of World War II, the time of immigration is important because the timing of immigrant waves is often related to specific events that shape the immigrant flow; for example, Mexican farm workers during the Bracero program, Cuban exiles during the 1950s and 1960s, and the current Central American refugees. Each of these flows has a specific character to it.

Although economic conditions are the focus of this analysis, the extent to which Anglos and Hispanics are marrying each other and living in the same neighborhoods provides another important measure of assimilation. The adoption of the English language also provides an indicator of assimilation. Therefore in section 7 we look at several measures of assimilation that are not directly socioeconomic in nature.

While this study examines a host of issue areas, it should be noted that we have not addressed some of the most important questions regarding the well-being of Hispanics. For example, some recent studies have suggested that most Hispanics immigrants are assimilated by the time the third generation matures, while others claim that a significant portion of Hispanics endure intergenerational poverty and welfare dependence. The data needed to address this and related questions were not available for this study.

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS.

Those who study Hispanics in the U.S. are confronted with conceptual uncertainties and limited availability of reliable data. Although neither of these limitations are overcome in this study, a word or two about their impact is in order.

No research on Hispanics in the U.S. is complete without a discussion about the use of the term Hispanic. Generally, the term Hispanic connotes a person who identifies with a Spanish heritage through ancestral ties to a Spanish-speaking country. But the definition is not always clear to everyone. For example, some people consider Portuguese-speaking Brazilians to be Hispanic because they are from Latin America. On the other hand, many Filipino immigrants have Spanish surnames, many can trace their ancestors back to Spain, and some speak fluent Spanish, but are they part of the Hispanic population?

Because they share the Spanish language the Hispanic population in the U.S. is often conceived of as a homogeneous American minority group. In reality, U.S. Hispanics (19.4 million as of March 1988), show both similarities and diversity. While most Hispanics share a common language and cultural ancestry, the diversity among Hispanics makes it difficult to speak in generalities. Several recent publications explore the variability within the Hispanic

population.⁷

Since it first attempted to gather information on Hispanics in the 1960 Census, the Census Bureau has modified its method of identifying the Hispanic population with each decennial census. Consequently, inter-censal comparisons are a little uncertain.⁸ For most data collection activities including the Census, self identification is used to identify Hispanics. If an individual indicates that he or she is of "Spanish Origin" on the Census form that is sufficient to include the person in the Hispanic population.

To a large extent "Hispanic" is a label that has been attached to this group by the dominant Anglo culture. It is likely that many individuals within Hispanic subpopulations view themselves as belonging not to a "Hispanic" group, but instead consider themselves to be Puerto Rican or Mexican American, Chicano, Guatemalan, etc.

Many individuals who are third or fourth generation

⁷. Portes and Truelove, 1987, "Making Sense of Diversity: Recent Research on Hispanic Minorities in the United States" Annual Review of Sociology, Vol 13.
Moore, J. and Pachon, H., 1985, "Hispanics in the United States", NJ, Prentice Hall, Inc..
Bean, F. and Tienda, M., 1987, "The Hispanic Population of the United States", NY, Russell Sage Foundation.
Valdivieso, R. and Davis, C., 1988, "U.S. Hispanics: Challenging Issues for the 1990s", Population Trends and Public Policy, Washington, DC, Population Reference Bureau.

⁸ For an excellent discussion of Census definitions see Bean, F. and Tienda, M., 1987, "The Hispanic Population of the United States", NY, Russell Sage Foundation: Chapter 2 and Appendix A.

immigrants may no longer consider themselves "Hispanic". Some resent the term "Hispanic" as an artificial designation forced upon them by outsiders and respond accordingly. Some are confused by questions which deal with race and heritage because Hispanics originate from many countries and can be black, white, Indian or of mixed heritage. It should also be noted that in Census Bureau data the question used to ascertain race is independent of the question on Spanish Origin, so people who indicate they are of Spanish Origin must also indicate whether they are white, black, Native American, Asian-American, or of some "other" race. Since many Hispanics are descendants of a mixture of Spanish colonists, indigenous groups, and African slaves, this can cause confusion. Furthermore, it confounds comparisons between Hispanics and whites because most Hispanics are also included in the figures for whites.

Research by the Census Bureau also indicates that about five to six percent of Hispanics were missed in the 1980 Census.⁹ It is not surprising that many Hispanics in the U.S. illegally are likely to avoid responding to the questions at all, or give false answers out of fear of being "discovered". It is widely believed that a large portion of the undocumented Hispanics in the U.S. are not reflected in

⁹. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988, The Coverage of the Population in the 1980 Census, Evaluation and Research Reports, PHC80-E4, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., February

the census or surveys. Many Hispanics who are legal U.S. residents are missed for the same reasons that blacks are missed.

There is the special case of Puerto Rico. Puerto Ricans who move to the mainland experience migration much like international migrants but technically they are U.S. citizens before they move. In this report we treat a move from Puerto Rico to the U.S. mainland just like a move from a foreign country to the U.S. Also, we consider those born in Puerto Rico to be foreign-born.

DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW: WHO ARE HISPANICS?

The public's interest in the Hispanic population has been fueled by recent growth in their numbers. The number of Hispanics in the U.S. increased by 34 percent between 1980 and 1988, while the nation's Non-Hispanic population increased by 6 percent over the same period of time.

The largest Hispanic subgroup is the Mexican-origin component which makes up 62 percent of the total. Second in size is the Puerto Rican group which comprises 13 percent of the total, followed closely by those who trace their roots back to Central or South American (12 percent of the total). The Cuban group are 5 percent of all U.S. Hispanics. About 8 percent of Hispanics indicate that they belong to some Hispanic group other than those mentioned above.

During the 1980s, the Central and South American origin

population grew by 40 percent and now number about 2.1 million persons. Civil and political unrest in that section of the hemisphere undoubtedly spurred migration to the U.S. during the 1980s. The Mexican origin population rose by 22 percent and now number about 11.8 million persons, the Puerto Rican population increased by 11 percent to 2.3 million, and the Cuban origin population increased by 7 percent to an estimated 1 million persons. "Other Hispanics" increased by 33 percent to 1.6 million persons.

Hispanics are heavily concentrated in just a few states. More than a third (34 percent) of all U.S. Hispanics live in California and another one-fifth (21 percent) live in Texas. Other states with large Hispanic populations include, New York (11 percent), and Florida (8 percent) and Illinois (4 percent)

Certain Hispanic subgroups are heavily concentrated in certain areas of the country. For example, 83 percent of the Mexican origin population resides in the five Southwestern states, with most living in California or Texas. More than 60 percent of all Cubans live in Florida. Puerto Ricans are concentrated in the Northeast, particularly New York and New Jersey. A large share of Central Americans are also found in California.¹⁰

¹⁰. Singer, A., 1985, Master's Thesis, University of Texas, Austin.

Section 2 - Income and Earnings of Hispanics

It is clear that the Hispanic population in the U.S. lags behind the white Non-Hispanic (Anglo) population on most measures of socioeconomic status. But this is not too surprising since a large share of Hispanics are immigrants, and immigrant groups typically have low socioeconomic status. Furthermore, the U.S. Hispanic population is clustered in the younger age groups where socioeconomic status is typically low. Median age of the Hispanic population in the U.S. in 1987 was 25.1 years compared to 32.6 years for Non-Hispanics¹¹.

If Hispanics are becoming assimilated into mainstream American society, one would expect Hispanics born in the U.S. to have higher socioeconomic status characteristics than Hispanic immigrants to the U.S.. Moreover, one would expect an improvement in the basic socioeconomic status of immigrants over time. That is, we would expect that earlier immigrants would have higher socioeconomic status than more recent immigrants. This is the traditional model of immigrant assimilation fostered by numerous studies of previous immigrant groups.

In this section we examine several key indicators of economic well-being including income and earnings. Each

¹¹. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987, Series P-20, No. 416, Table 3

measure is examined in terms of the entire Hispanic population and to the extent possible each Hispanic subgroup. Changes observed between 1980 and 1988 are analyzed. An examination of differences between native and foreign-born groups well as the changes in the characteristics by year of immigration is also presented.

Income

A recent report from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities¹² indicates that Hispanics have lost ground economically during the past ten years compared to both whites and blacks. The low income of Hispanics is reflected in the most recent statistics from the Census Bureau¹³ which show that the median family income of Hispanics was \$20,306, just 63 percent that of whites, whose income was \$32,274 in 1987.

While the median family income of Hispanics is somewhat higher than that of blacks (\$18,098), real family income of Hispanics declined more rapidly than that of blacks in recent years. Between 1978 and 1987, the median income of white families grew by one percent after adjusting for inflation but the median family income for Hispanic families fell by

12. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 1988, Shortchanged: Recent Developments in Hispanic Poverty, Income and Employment, Washington, D.C., November.

13. U.S. Bureau of the Census, August, 1988, Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1987. Current Population Reports: Consumer Income: Series P-60, No. 161,

more than 7 percent. The real (inflation-adjusted) median family income of blacks fell by 4.5 percent during the period¹⁴.

The median weekly earnings of full-time Hispanic male workers was 74 percent of comparable white males workers in 1979, but in 1987 the figure was 68 percent. Thus both family income and individual earnings have eroded for Hispanics in the last 10 years compared to those of whites and blacks.¹⁵

During the 1980's all Hispanic subgroups experienced a decrease in real median family income (see Table 2.1). The overall decline in median family income for all Hispanics between 1979 and 1987 was 8.5 percent. However, the decline was most pronounced among Puerto Ricans (-13.2 percent) and Mexicans (-12.1 percent). The decline among Cubans (-6.5 percent) and among U.S. Hispanics from Central and South America (-1.3 percent) was much lower.

The decline of Hispanic incomes during the 1980s stands in stark contrast to the experience of Hispanics during the 1970s. Overall, Hispanic median family income grew by 18.1 percent between 1969 and 1979, but that was largely the product of strong income growth among Mexicans and Cubans

14. U.S. Bureau of the Census, August, 1988, Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1987. Current Population Reports: Consumer Income: Series P-60, No. 161,

15. U.S. Bureau of the Census, August, 1988, Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1987. Current Population Reports: Consumer Income: Series P-60, No. 161.

(see Table 2.1). The incomes of Puerto Ricans and Central/South Americans decreased from 1969 to 1979.

To some extent the difference in Hispanic income changes during the 1970s and 1980s are related to broader changes in the economy. During the 1970s, the median family income of all Americans grew by 10.7 percent, but between 1979 and 1987, it grew by only 0.6 percent(see Table 2.1).

However, a large share of Hispanic live in California where the economy has performed above average during the 1980s. Florida, another state exhibiting good economic performance during the 1980s, also has a relatively large number of Hispanics. In light of this, the decline in median family income of Hispanics is even more striking. While these aggregate statistics suggest a decline in Hispanic socioeconomic status, it is possible that assimilation and socioeconomic advancement are taking place, but that the overall statistics remain low for Hispanics because of the large number of new immigrants who tend to have lower incomes.

It should also be noted that Hispanics are more highly concentrated in the younger ages, where incomes are generally lower which may compound the discrepancy between Hispanics and Anglos. The median income of whites age 18 to 24 was \$6,564 in 1986, which is nearly identical to the median

income of Hispanics (\$6,426) in this age range¹⁶. However, only 15 percent of white adults are in the 18-24 year age group compared to 22 percent of Hispanics. The high concentration of Hispanics in this relatively low-income age group acts to depress the overall average.

This indicates that young Hispanics are closer to economic parity with whites than are older Hispanics. If the small gap between today's young Hispanics and whites remains constant as they grow older, the overall economic gap between Anglos and Hispanics should diminish over time.

Native-born Hispanics typically had higher family incomes than foreign-born Hispanics in 1969 and 1979 (see Table 2.2). In the case of Cubans in 1979, the higher incomes of foreign-born may be due to the fact that most of the native-born Cubans are the children born to those who fled Cuba in the late 1950's and early 1960s. Consequently, the native-born group is quite young compared to the foreign-born Cubans and this skews the comparison. Bean & Tioenda show that the median age of native-born Cubans in 1980 was 11.4 years compared to median of 43.1 years among foreign-born Cubans.¹⁷

In two cases--Cubans in 1969 and Other Hispanics in

16. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988, "Money Income of Households, Families, and Persons in the United States: 1986," Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 159, Table 33, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. , June.

17. Bean, F. and Tienda, M., 1987, "The Hispanic Population of the United States, NY, Russell Sage Foundation: Table 2.7.

1979-- the incomes of foreign-born and native-born are essentially the same. The situation regarding Cubans has already been addressed. The group labeled "other Hispanics" is such a hodge-podge that it is hard to draw any conclusions from the fact that foreign-born and native-born members of this group had incomes that are nearly equal.

The income level of Hispanics immigrants in 1980 relative to their time of arrival in this country sheds important light on the assimilation process. Those who immigrated to the U.S. between 1975 and 1980 report lower median family income than groups who arrived early (see Table 2.3). That is, the longer an Hispanic has been in the country the higher their family income.

Since recent immigrants are likely to be young, age is a factor in their low family income. In any case, the gradual increase in family income as the period of time in the U.S. increases suggests that Hispanic immigrants do have the opportunity to move up the socioeconomic ladder over time. This indicates a degree of assimilation for these families.

Earnings

Since family income is affected by family composition and labor force participation, median family income is not always reflective of how individuals workers are doing. In this regard it should be noted that the per capita income of Hispanics has remained steady at around 60 percent that of

total population since 1973.¹⁸

An examination (in Table 2.4) of the earnings of Hispanic males provides a somewhat different picture. Among Mexicans, the largest Hispanic subgroup, the earnings of foreign-born males are below those of native-born males in both 1969 and 1979. However, for both Puerto Ricans and Cubans, the earnings of foreign-born males are considerably above those of native-born males in 1979. These differences are produced partly by differences in the age structure, as the native-born Hispanics are considerably younger than their foreign-born counterparts.¹⁹

18. U.S. Bureau of the Census, August, 1988, Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1987. Current Population Reports: Consumer Income: Series P-60, No. 161, Tables 3, 13, and 16.

19 Bean, F. and Tienda, M., 1987, "The Hispanic Population of the United States, NY, Russell Sage Foundation: Table 3.3.

Table 2.1. Median Family Income of Hispanic Subgroups: 1969, 1979, 1987
(figures expressed in 1987 dollars)

	Total U.S.	All Hispanics	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central/South American	Other Hispanic
<u>1969</u>	\$27,703	\$18,792	\$19,065	\$18,135	\$25,265	\$24,645	\$22,785
<u>1979</u>	30,669	22,185	22,718	17,486	29,200	23,235	26,805
<u>1987</u>	30,853	20,306	19,968	15,185	27,294	22,939	21,196
Percentage Change 1969-1979	10.7	18.1%	19.2	-3.6	15.6	-5.7	17.6
Percentage Change 1979-1987	0.6	-8.5%	-12.1	-13.2	-6.5	-1.3	-20.9

Source: For the 1969 median family income of all Hispanics see U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population, PC(1)-C1, Table 122; for 1979 and 1987 median family income for all Hispanics see U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 161, Table 3; For all other figures, 1970 and 1980 Public Use Microdata Sample (Bean and Tienda, 1987, Table 10.1) and U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988, Current Population Reports, "The Hispanic Population of the United States: March 1988 (Advance Report)", Series P-20, No. 431, Table 2.

Table 2.2. Median Family Income of Foreign-born and Native Born* Hispanics in the U.S.: 1969 and 1979.

	<u>Mexican</u>	<u>Puerto Rican</u>	<u>Cuban</u>	<u>Central/ South American</u>	<u>Other Hispanic</u>
<u>1969</u>					
Foreign-Born	\$5,450	\$5,650	\$8,150	\$7,650	\$6,950
Native-born	7,050	7,250	8,150	8,150	7,550
Foreign-born as a percent of Native-born	77.3	77.9	100	93.9	92.1
<u>1979</u>					
Foreign-Born	13,005	10,692	18,470	14,400	17,150
Native-Born	16,010	11,375	17,005	18,060	17,005
Foreign-born as a percent of Native-born	81.2	94.0	108.6	79.7	100.9

SOURCE: Bean and Tienda, 1988, Table 10.2

*Foreign born/Native Born refers to the status of the Head of Household.

Table 2.3. Median Family Income by Year of Immigration of the Householder. Hispanic Population, Ages 16 to 64 Years:1979.

	All Hispanics	Mexican	Cuban	Other Hispanic
Year Immigrated				
1975-1980	\$11,010	\$11,010	\$8,630	\$11,510
1970-1974	14,210	13,013	17,985	14,978
1960-1969	16,560	14,510	20,510	16,605
Pre-1960	17,013	16,175	19,573	19,250

Source: PRB Analysis of a one-percent 1980 Public Use Micro-data Sample from the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

We were unable to calculate corresponding figures for Puerto Ricans because technically, Puerto Ricans who move from the Island to the U.S. mainland are not immigrants. Our limited data file did not contain information on place of birth.

Table 2.4. Median Earnings of Foreign-born and Native-Born Male Hispanics in the U.S. in 1969 and 1979.

	<u>Mexican</u>	<u>Puerto Rican</u>	<u>Cuban</u>	<u>Central/ South American</u>	<u>Other Hispanic</u>
<u>1969</u>					
Foreign-Born	\$4,417	4,599	4,872	5,510	4,918
Native-born	4,599	4,599	5,191	5,328	5,510
Foreign-born as a percent of Native-born	96.0	100	93.9	103.4	89.3
<u>1979</u>					
Foreign-Born	\$3,682	4,602	5,062	4,547	4,846
Native-Born	4,602	3,590	3,705	4,506	5,062
Foreign-born as a percent of Native-born	80.0	128.2	136.6	100.9	95.7

SOURCE: Bean and Tienda, 1988, Table 10.8

Section 3 - Poverty And Welfare

Income and earnings of groups are usually closely related to poverty levels and that is true among the groups examined here. The low income figures for Hispanics are reflected in high poverty rates.

In 1987, the poverty rate of Hispanics was 2.7 times that of the white population. While Hispanics comprise approximately eight percent of the total population, they account for 17 percent of the poverty population. The 1987 poverty rate of Hispanics was not as high as that of blacks, but the poverty rate among Hispanics has increased more rapidly than that for blacks during the past decade²⁰.

Figure 3.1 shows the poverty rate for Hispanics increased from 22 percent in 1978 to 28 percent in 1987; an increase of nearly 30 percent. The increased poverty rates of whites (an increase of 21 percent) and blacks (an increase of 8 percent) was less than that experienced by Hispanics.

Although the poverty rate of Hispanic female-headed families is high (55 percent in 1987), the increase in Hispanic poverty over the decade was not caused by an increase in the number of female-headed families. Hispanic married-couple families recorded a 50 percent increase in the poverty rate (from 12 percent in 1978 to 18 percent in 1987). In contrast, the percentage of black and white married-couple families in poverty

²⁰. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 1988, Shortchanged: Recent Developments in Hispanic Poverty, Income and Employment, Washington, D.C., November.

increased by 9 percent and 11 percent, respectively during this period. The poverty rate for all American families increased by 17 percent between 1979 and 1987.²¹

For all Hispanics, the poverty rate increased only slightly more than Americans in general between 1979 and 1987, but there was significant variation among Hispanic subgroups (Table 3.1). The rate of increase of poverty among Mexican families (24 percent) was somewhat higher than for whites, but the rate of increase among Puerto Rican families (9 percent) was only about half the rate of increase witnessed among all U.S. families. It should be noted, however, that the rate of poverty among Puerto Rican families was extremely high in both 1979 and 1987. Poverty among Cuban families increased at nearly the same rate as white families, and the "Other Hispanics" experienced a 31 percent increase in poverty.

Table 3.2 shows family poverty rates in 1969 and 1979 for foreign-born and native-born Hispanic from different subgroups. Poverty rates for the foreign-born are usually higher than for those born in the U.S. The very large difference seen among Cubans in 1969, in which the poverty rate of foreign-born was nearly four times that of native-born, may well reflect the extent to which the foreign-born Cubans who immigrated in the 1960s had not yet moved into the U.S. economy. By 1979, the poverty rates of foreign-born and native-born were much closer together.

²¹. U.S. Bureau of the Census.

In 1979, the only Hispanic subgroup in which the poverty rate of the foreign-born was lower than that of the native-born was among the "Other Hispanic". However, this group is such a conceptual hodge-podge that it is hard to decipher the meaning of these data.

The poverty rate of Hispanics decreases as their time in the U.S. increases (see Table 3.3). Thus, it appears that the economic situation of Hispanic immigrants improves over the years. Again, in the case of Cubans, the values for the 1960s immigrants reflect their special circumstances and socioeconomic level at time of arrival in the U.S.

Welfare Use Among Hispanics

The number of Hispanics receiving benefits from each of five major welfare programs has risen dramatically during the 1980s (Table 3,4), but this increase is not due to an increase in the rate of welfare use by Hispanics, but rather to the growth in the absolute number of poor Hispanics.

The number of Hispanics in poverty grew from 2.9 million in 1979 to 5.5 million in 1987: a 90 percent increase. While the number of Hispanics in poverty was increasing during the 1980s, the rate of welfare use among Hispanics in poverty changed very little. In fact, poor Hispanics were slightly less likely to use most major welfare programs in 1988 than they were at the beginning of this decade. This decline may be due to sharp domestic budget cuts in the 1980's which restricted access to

programs.²² It also may be related to the relatively large number of immigrants in the Hispanic population many of whom may be unfamiliar with the U.S. welfare system.

Approximately half of the 5.5 million Hispanics in poverty in 1987 were children which is noteworthy because the only major welfare program that reaches the majority of Hispanics is the subsidized school lunch program. As can be seen in Table 3.4, about 92 percent of poor Hispanic school-age children receive this benefit. Only 30 percent of poor Hispanics receive cash public assistance, 13 percent live in public housing, 49 percent receive food stamps, and 42 percent receive medicaid.

The rate of participation by poor Hispanics in the five major welfare programs examined here, is higher than the rate of poor whites, but lower than the rate of poor blacks. This may reflect the extent to which Hispanics suffer long-term poverty more than whites. It may also mean that poor Hispanics are less likely than poor blacks to become trapped in the web of poverty and welfare dependency that characterizes a portion of the black population living in "underclass" neighborhoods. To the extent that Hispanics are less likely than blacks to be trapped in intergenerational cycles of poverty and welfare dependency they are more likely to experience socioeconomic mobility.

Table 3.5 provides 1970 and 1980 data on the receipt of public assistance by Hispanic subgroups and others, by foreign-

22. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, November, 1988, Shortchanged: Recent Developments in Hispanic Poverty, Income and Employment, Washington, DC.

born/native-born status. These data provide a mixed picture. Among Mexicans, for example, the foreign born were more likely than the native-born to receive public assistance in 1970, but the reverse was true in 1980. Among Puerto Ricans, the foreign-born were more likely than native-born to receive public assistance at both points in time. And the same was true for Cubans. Among those whose origins are Central or South American, the native-born were more likely than the foreign born to receive public assistance in 1970 but less likely in 1980.

Deciphering the meaning of the figures in Table 3.5 is further complicated by the fact that for some groups the rate of welfare receipt went up between 1970 and 1980, and for others it went down.

The rate of welfare receipt among Hispanics is lower than the rate for Non-Hispanic whites among both the foreign-born and the native-born. Foreign-born blacks usually have lower rates of welfare receipt than do foreign-born Hispanics. Among the native-born, Puerto Ricans have higher rates than blacks, but other Hispanic subgroups have lower rates.

I think it is fair to say that it is hard to discern any patterns here. It seems likely that the impact of low income and poverty is mitigated by other factors in determining the use of the welfare system by Hispanics.

Figure 3.1

Table 3.1. Percent of Hispanic Families in Poverty: 1979 and 1987

	<u>White</u>	<u>All Hispanics</u>	<u>Mexican</u>	<u>Puerto Rican</u>	<u>Cuban</u>	<u>Other Hispanic</u>
1979	6.9	21.3	20.6	34.9	11.7	16.7
1987	8.2	25.8	25.5	37.9	13.8	21.9
Percent Change	18.8	21.1	23.8	8.6	17.9	31.1

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983, 1980 Census of Population, PC80-1-C1, Table 171; and U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 431, Table 2; and Current Population Reports, P-60, No. 161.

Table 3.2. Family Poverty Rates of Foreign-Born and Native-Born Hispanics in the U.S. in 1969 and 1979

	<u>Mexican</u>	<u>Puerto Rican</u>	<u>Cuban</u>	<u>Central/ South American</u>	<u>Other Hispanic</u>
<u>1969</u>					
Foreign-Born	30.0	29.2	13.5	13.3	18.0
Native-born	24.4	21.1	3.6	17.4	21.5
Foreign-born as a percent of Native-born	123.0	138.4	375.0	76.4	83.7
<u>1979</u>					
Foreign-Born	24.0	34.6	11.2	20.0	13.5
Native-Born	19.2	28.4	10.2	15.4	15.0
Foreign-born as a percent of Native-born	125.0	121.8	109.8	129.9	90.0

SOURCE: Bean and Tienda, 1987, Table 10.4

Foreign born/Native-born refers to the status of the Head of Household.

Table 3.3. Poverty Rate of Hispanics Aged 16 to 64, by Country of Origin and Period of Immigration:1980.

	Percent in Poverty			
	Total	Mexican	Cuban	Other Spanish
Year of Immigration				
1975-1979	30.5%	30.8%	43.6%	28.1%
1970-1974	19.9%	23.7%	9.3%	16.9%
1960-1969	16.0%	21.7%	9.0%	14.8%
Pre-1960	14.7%	17.5%	9.2%	9.7%

Source: PRB Analysis of one-percent 1980 Public Use Micro-data Sample.

Corresponding figures could not be calculated for Puerto Ricans, because technically, a move from Puerto Rico to the mainland is not immigration. Place of birth information was not available on our file.

Table 3.4. Receipt of Welfare by Non-Hispanic Whites, Blacks and Hispanics in Poverty: 1980 and 1988.

	<u>Percent of Poor Receiving Benefits in Each Program</u>									
	<u>Cash Public Assistance</u>		<u>Public* Housing</u>		<u>Subsidized** School Lunch</u>		<u>Food Stamps</u>		<u>Medicaid</u>	
	<u>1980</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1988</u>
Non-Hispanic Whites	18	17	10	10	67	76	35	36	30	34
Blacks	40	36	29	29	92	94	65	64	54	54
Hispanics	32	30	13	13	92	92	55	49	44	42
Number of Poor Hispanics receiving benefit (in 1000s).	934	1,644	260	532	1,632	3,127	1,617	2,693	1,276	2,311

Source: PRB Analysis of Census Bureau's March, 1980 and March, 1988 Current Population Survey tapes.

* for renters only

** for households with children age 5 to 17

Table 3.5 Receipt of Public Assistance Among Native-born and Foreign-born Hispanics: 1970 and 1980

Percent of Population Receiving Public Assistance							
	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central/ South American	Other Hispanic	Black	Non-Hispanic White
<u>1970</u>							
Foreign	11.2	21.7	7.6	4.4	5.6	4.2	1.8
Native	8.2	16.1	3.6	6.7	8.6	12.2	2.0
<u>1980</u>							
Foreign	7.4	25.0	7.4	10.3	5.6	6.3	3.2
Native	9.8	21.9	1.7	7.7	8.4	16.4	3.2

Source: Bean and Tienda, 1987, Table 10.5

Section 4 - Education

During the 1980s, the average educational attainment of Hispanics has increased, but the educational attainment of Hispanics still lags far behind that of Non-Hispanic whites. This is important because it is widely believed that education is the key to socioeconomic mobility. The traditional model of immigrant assimilation stresses the role of education and many former immigrant groups used the public education system to move up the socioeconomic ladder.

The percent of Hispanics who have 4 years or more of high school increased from 44 percent to 51 percent between 1980 and 1988 (Table 4.1), while the percent who have 4 or more years of college increased from 7.6 to 10.0. The median school years completed has also increased from 10.8 to 12.0 between 1980 and 1988.

Whether this reflects improvements in the education of native-born and older immigrant Hispanics or a higher level of education of the more recent immigrants is unclear, but the rising level of education among Hispanics suggests that they are achieving socioeconomic advancement and perhaps becoming more assimilated.

When compared with the non-Hispanic whites and blacks, however, the gains by Hispanics are moderate. The number the non-Hispanic white and black adults who did not finish high school dropped 35 and 27 percent, respectively, between 1980 and 1988, while the number of Hispanics dropped by only 12.5 percent.

Therefore, the increases in educational levels observed for the Hispanic population, however positive, must be considered in light of the gains made by other segments of the population. While the education level of Hispanics is improving, convergence with the Anglo population is still a long way off.

Examination of Hispanic subgroups (Table 4.1) shows that Mexican and Puerto Ricans have larger shares of their population that do not have at least 12 years of education; both about 60 percent. Among Cubans and Other Hispanics, a little over 40 percent of the population age 25 plus did not have at least 12 years of education.

Data in Table 4.1 show one-fifth of Mexicans and one-fourth of Puerto Ricans have some college or post-secondary education. About a third of Cubans and Other Hispanics have completed more than 12 years of education.

Foreign-born Hispanics aged 25 years and over have a much lower level of education than native-born (Table 4.2) although the over all trend since 1960 is upward for all subgroups. Examination of the Mexican and Cuban immigrant population ages 25 to 64 years by year of immigration, (see Table 4.3), illustrates the important differences between these two Hispanic populations, in this case in regard to educational levels. Whereas 76.9 percent of the foreign born population from Mexico report less than 12 years of education, Cuban-born Hispanics reveal only 42.5 percent who have less than 12 years. These striking differences between the two Hispanic populations extend to the higher levels

of education as well. Three times as many Cuban immigrants have had some college education as Mexican immigrants.

Of those who arrived between 1975 and 1979, 82 percent from Mexico have not had 12 years of high school. Of those from Cuba, only 56 percent had a similar level of education. In general, the level of education is higher in both subgroups among the earlier immigrants. In the case of Mexico, this fact probably indicates an improvement in the socioeconomic status after arrival since there is no reason to believe that those who immigrated earlier were better educated than recent arrivals. This indicates that some improvement occurs as the number of years spent in the United States increases. In turn, this could influence the other economic characteristic, since higher educational levels usually lead to jobs with higher status and pay.

In the case of Cubans, however, the higher level of education for those who arrived in the 1960s is probably related to the influx of better educated Cubans as a result of Castro's rise in Cuba in the early 1960s. The differences between these two groups highlight the diversity of the Hispanic population--the differences in the characteristics of those who migrate, as well as the differences in the reasons and timing of migration.

Table 4.1. Educational Levels, by Race and Hispanic Origin,
Ages 25 and Over:1980 and 1988.

	Less Than High School (under 12 years)		High School (12 years)		Some College (over 12 years)	
	1980	1988	1980	1988	1980	1988
Non-Hispanic White	30.4%	19.9%	36.0%	37.9%	33.5%	42.2%
Non-Hispanic Black	48.8	35.6	29.3	35.5	21.9	28.0
Hispanic Origin	56.0	49.0	24.4	26.4	19.6	24.5
Mexican	62.4	55.4	22.2	24.7	15.3	19.9
Puerto Rican	59.9	49.3	24.6	25.8	15.6	24.9
Cuban	44.6	39.5	25.2	26.1	30.1	34.4
Other	42.6	35.6	28.9	31.5	28.5	33.0

Source: 1980 data: U.S. Bureau of the Census, General
Social and Economic Characteristics. Chapter C, U.S.
Summary, Table 166.

1988 data: Analysis of 1988 CPS March Supplement tape.

Table 4.2. Educational Level of the Hispanic Population, Ages 25 to 64, by Period of Immigration:1980.

	PERCENT			Total Population (in 1000s)
	Less Than High School	High School	Some College	
Total Hispanic	53.2	23.4	23.3	6,032
Native Born	48.5	27.1	24.4	3,630
Total Foreign Born	60.5	18.0	21.6	2,402
Immigrated 1975-1979	66.4	13.9	19.7	464
Immigrated 1970-1974	67.0	16.4	16.6	575
Immigrated 1960-1969	55.3	20.0	25.0	888
Immigrated Pre-1960	56.8	20.2	23.0	476

Source: Analysis of a 1/100 sample 1980 PUMS tape.

Table 4.3. Educational Level of the Hispanic Population of Mexican Origin, Ages 25 to 64, by Period of Immigration:1980.

	PERCENT			Total Population (in 1000s)
	< High School	High School	Some College	
Total (Mexican Origin)	59.9	21.2	18.9	3,366
Native Born	50.5	26.2	23.3	2,163
Total Foreign Born	76.9	12.1	11.1	1,203
Immigrated 1975-1979	82.6	8.0	9.5	253
Immigrated 1970-1974	81.8	10.0	8.2	304
Immigrated 1960-1969	75.8	13.5	10.7	348
Immigrated Pre-1960	68.3	16.0	15.7	298

Source: Analysis of a 1/100 sample 1980 PUMS tape.

Table 4.4. Educational Level of the Cuban Origin Population, Ages 25 to 64, by Period of Immigration:1980.

	PERCENT			Total Population (in 1000s)
	< High School	High School	Some College	
Total (Cuban Origin)	41.5	24.2	34.3	429
Native Born	27.5*	29.2*	43.3	28
Total Foreign Born	42.5	23.9	33.6	401
Immigrated 1970-1979	56.0	22.4	21.6	95
Immigrated 1960-1969	37.9	23.3	38.8	246
Immigrated Pre-1960	40.0	28.6	31.4	60

* Observations too few in number to be reliable.

Source: Analysis of a 1/100 sample 1980 PUMS tape.

Section 5 - Occupation and Labor Force Participation

An individual's role in the labor force has long been a prime indicator of socioeconomic status and occupational changes have often been used as a measure of social mobility.²³

In this section three dimensions of labor force involvement are examined; 1) the labor force participation rate, 2) the rate of unemployment, and 3) the occupational structure.

Labor Force Participation

The labor force participation of Hispanic males held steady during the 1980s with about 80 percent of Hispanic men reporting that they were in the labor force (Table 5.1). The labor force participation rate for Hispanic females climbed from 48 percent in 1980 to 52 percent in 1988.²⁴

Among the Hispanic subgroups, Puerto Rican males had the lowest rate of labor force participation in 1988 and during the 1980s there was a steady decline in the labor force participation rate of Puerto Rican males from 72.2 percent in 1980 to 68.6 percent in 1988. Interestingly, Puerto Rican females also had the lowest rate of labor force participation in 1988, but their

23. Blau, P. and Duncan, O., 1967, "The American Occupational Structure, NY, Wiley.
Duncan, D. and Featherman, D., 1972, "Socioeconomic Background and Achievement", NY: Seminar Press.
Farley, R. and Neirdert, L., 1985, "Assimilation in the United States: An Analysis of Ethnic and Generation Differences in Status and Achievement", American Sociological Review, Vol 50.

24. At least part of this increase may be the results of measurement error due to small sample sizes.

rate of labor force participation increased steadily between 1980 and 1988, from 35.0 to 40.9 percent.

At least part of the changes in labor force participation among Puerto Ricans may be related to their concentration in the New York City area. The economic distress witnessed in this area of the country, which hit those with lower levels of educational attainment specially hard, is far different from the economic landscape in California, Texas and Florida where most other Hispanic groups are concentrated. Furthermore, the shift from manufacturing to service-based employment may help explain why Puerto Rican male labor force participation fell while that for Puerto Rican females climbed... jobs in traditionally male occupations shrank while jobs in occupations traditionally filled by females expanded.

Labor force participation rates are higher for immigrants than for native-born Hispanics (Table 5.2) but those who most recently immigrated have the lowest participation rate (65.7 percent) of the foreign-born groups. The low labor force participation rate of this group of recent arrivals may reflect a high concentration of immigrants who have not yet obtained a job. Generally, the participation rate increases as the time since arrival increases, although it declines for those who arrived before 1960. Some of these pre-1960 immigrants are approaching retirement age and an age when disabilities are more likely. These same forces could explain the trends in unemployment, which is highest for those who just arrived and declines for those who

have been here longer, increasing only slightly for immigrants who arrived before 1960. No trends emerge, however, when the Hispanic subgroups are examined by year of immigration with regard to labor force participation.

In short, labor force participation is higher for immigrants than for native-born and the labor force participation rate of immigrants who arrived in an earlier period is higher than the rate for those who arrived more recently.

Unemployment

Participation in the labor force is just the first step toward obtaining a job. Many of those in the labor force are unemployed. Unemployment rates for Hispanics during the 1980s are shown in Table 5.2.

Unemployment for Hispanics increased between 1980 and 1982 as the economic recession deepened in the U.S., but as the economic recovery unfolded, the unemployment rate decreased. The unemployment rate among Hispanic males fell from a high of 16.3 percent in 1983 to 9.5 percent in 1988 (Table 5.3). The unemployment rate for Hispanic females also fell between 1982 and 1988, but it fell more rapidly than that of Hispanic males. In 1980 and 1982, the unemployment rate for Hispanic females was higher than that for Hispanic males, but in 1986 and 1988 it was considerably lower.

The juxtaposition of male and female unemployment rates among Hispanics during the 1980s may be a product of a changing

economic base which is shifting from heavy manufacturing to services. The high-paying blue-collar jobs that were the mainstay of minority male employment are being replaced by lower-paying "pink-collar" jobs typically staffed by females.

The 1980 unemployment rate of Native-born working age Hispanics (9.3 percent) was slightly higher than that for foreign-born Hispanics (8.7 percent) (Table 5.2). It may be the case that the demographic composition of the foreign-born working-age population is responsible for this difference. Males typically have lower rates of unemployment than females, and the foreign-born population is disproportionately male.

Those foreign-born Hispanics who arrived in an earlier time period have lower unemployment rates than those who arrived more recently (see Table 5.2). The 1980 unemployment rate for those who arrived between 1975 and 1980 was 9.8 percent compared to around 8 percent for those who arrived prior to 1970. This data supports the traditional model of assimilation which suggests that immigrants become more assimilated over time.

Occupation

White-collar occupations usually provide higher incomes and connote a higher socioeconomic status than other occupational categories. Between 1980 and 1988, the Hispanic labor force has experienced a small but steady increase in the percentage of the labor force employed in white-collar occupations (Table 5.4). In 1980, about 35 percent of all Hispanic workers were classified as

white-collar workers, whereas in 1988, almost 40 percent are in white-collar jobs. At the same time the percent of the Hispanic workforce classified as blue-collar declined from 45 percent in 1980 to 37 percent in 1988. This suggests that some shift by Hispanics from blue-collar occupations to white-collar jobs took place during this period.

This suggests that some shift by Hispanics from blue-collar occupations to white-collar jobs took place during this period. Since many new immigrants, who usually possess job skills more suited to blue-collar and agricultural jobs are included in these figures, the shift from blue-collar to white-collar jobs is undoubtedly more prevalent among native-born Hispanics.

While there has been a rise in the share of workers in white-collar occupations for all Hispanic subgroups during the 1980s, notable differences among the Hispanic subgroups are evident in Table 5.4. For Mexicans, 35 percent were in white-collar jobs in 1988, compared to only 31 percent in 1980. Among Puerto Ricans, 46 percent of workers were in white-collar occupations in 1988, compared to only 35 percent in 1980. Almost three out of five (59 percent) of Cubans were in white-collar occupations in 1988; up from 50 percent in 1984.

It is noteworthy that Puerto Ricans trail most other Hispanic groups in nearly every measure of income and education, but they have a relatively high share of workers in white-collar occupations. This may be the result of their concentration in the New York metropolitan area where white-collar jobs are more

prevalent.

Whether a person was foreign-born or native-born has a substantial impact on their likelihood of being in a white-collar job (see Table 5.5). In 1980, 39 percent of native-born Hispanic workers were in white-collar occupations compared to only 28 percent of foreign-born Hispanic workers. On the other hand, foreign-born Hispanic workers were more likely than native-born workers to be found in blue-collar occupations. In 1980, about 17 percent of both foreign-born and native-born Hispanic workers were in service occupations. Foreign-born Hispanic workers were almost twice as likely native-born to be in working in agriculture.

Based on data collected in the 1980 Census, the longer a Hispanic had been in the country, the higher the likelihood that that the person would be working in a white-collar job.

For those who arrived between 1975 and 1980, about 1 out of 5 (19 percent) of those employed were in white-collar occupations, 50 percent worked in blue-collar occupations, 20 percent worked in service jobs and 10.6 percent were in agriculture and forestry (see Table 5.6). For those who had immigrated between 1970 and 1975 there is a shift away from service and agriculture occupations toward white and blue-collar jobs. For the 1960s immigrants, a high percentage are found in white-collar jobs (35.9), although this figure is still below the 39 percent for native-born Hispanic workers.

Table 5.1. Civilian Labor Force Participation Rate of the Hispanic Population Ages 16 years and Over by Sex: 1980 to 1988

	Non Hispanic Persons	Percent in Labor Force				Other Hispanic
		All Hispanics	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	
<u>MALE</u>						
1980		79.9	82.8	72.2	NA	NA
1982	74.8	80.5	83.6	71.5	NA	NA
1984	74.1	79.0	80.4	70.9	77.7	80.6
1986	74.0	79.0	81.1	67.8	78.2	79.0
1988	73.9	78.9	80.4	68.6	77.2	80.6
<u>FEMALE</u>						
1980		48.0	49.6	35.0	NA	NA
1982	52.3	48.7	49.7	35.6	NA	NA
1984	53.4	49.6	50.1	36.8	55.1	55.6
1986	55.2	48.9	49.1	37.8	53.9	53.7
1988	56.2	52.1	52.4	40.9	53.6	57.6

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 431, Table 2. Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1988, No. 619; 1986, No. 670; 1982, No. 676.

Table 5.2. Hispanic Labor Force Participation Rate and Unemployment Rate by Country of Origin and Period of Immigration, Ages 16 to 64: 1980.

	PERCENT	
	In Labor Force	Unemployed
Total Hispanic	66.3	9.0
Native-born	64.4	9.3
Total Foreign-born	69.9	8.7
Immigrated 1975-1979	65.7	9.8
Immigrated 1970-1974	71.4	8.7
Immigrated 1960-1969	72.2	8.0
Immigrated Pre-1960	69.2	8.1

Source: PRB Analysis of 1/100 sample 1980 Census Public-Use Microdata Sample file.

Table 5.3. Unemployment of the Hispanic Population, Ages 16 years and Over: 1980 to 1988

	Non Hispanic Persons	Percent of Labor Force Unemployed				
		All Hispanics	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Other Hispanic
<u>MALE</u>						
1980		8.3	8.4	11.5	NA	NA
1982	10.1	13.3	13.0	20.8	NA	NA
1984	8.4	11.6	12.6	11.8	8.6	8.9
1986	7.5	11.3	11.7	16.4	6.3	9.2
1988	6.1	9.5	11.0	8.2	4.1	7.4
<u>FEMALE</u>						
1980		10.5	11.8	13.0	NA	NA
1982	8.7	13.5	13.9	11.7	NA	NA
1984	7.5	11.6	11.9	15.6	4.8	11.5
1986	7.0	9.5	10.3	14.1	4.1	7.3
1988	5.4	7.0	7.7	10.5	1.7	5.2

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 431, Table 2. Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1988, No. 619; 1986, No. 670; 1982, No. 676.

Table 5.4. Occupation of Hispanic Workers Ages 16 Years and Over:
1980 to 1988

	Percent in each Occupational Category				
	All Hispanics	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Other Hispanic
<u>1980</u>					
White-collar	35.0	31.0	35.3	NA	NA
Service	16.5	16.6	19.3	NA	NA
Agri/Forest	3.4	4.7	1.0	NA	NA
Blue-collar	45.2	47.7	44.5	NA	NA
<u>1982</u>					
White-collar	36.5	32.1	41.3	NA	NA
Service	17.1	16.5	17.2	NA	NA
Agri/Forest	3.2	4.9	0.2	NA	NA
Blue-collar	43.2	46.5	41.3	NA	NA
<u>1984</u>					
White-collar	37.6	33.2	41.4	50.3	43.4
Service	18.2	17.9	20.3	12.3	20.2
Agri/Forest	5.0	7.4	2.0	1.1	1.0
Blue-collar	39.2	41.4	36.2	36.3	35.4
<u>1986</u>					
White-collar	37.8	33.5	43.7	54.1	41.1
Service	18.9	17.9	20.4	12.6	23.3
Agri/Forest	4.3	6.2	1.2	1.1	1.7
Blue-collar	39.0	42.3	34.7	32.2	33.9
<u>1988</u>					
White-collar	39.9	34.8	45.9	58.9	44.8
Service	17.6	16.6	17.5	11.7	22.2
Agri/Forest	5.5	7.9	1.0	0.9	2.3
Blue-collar	37.0	40.7	35.6	28.5	30.7

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 431, Table 2. Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1988, No. 619; 1986, No. 670; 1982, No. 676.

Table 5.5. Occupation* of the Hispanic Population age 16 to 64 by Place of Birth: 1980.

	PERCENT			
	White	Blue		
	Collar	Collar	Service	Agriculture
Total Hispanic	35.2	42.2	17.0	5.6
Native-born	39.4	39.1	17.3	4.2
Total Foreign-born	28.2	47.5	16.5	7.8

Source: PRB Analysis of one-percent Public-Use Microdata Sample file.

*The occupation of those who have worked since 1975 is included.

Table 5.6. Occupation* of Hispanics Age 16 to 64 by Period of Immigration: 1980.

<u>Period of Immigration</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>			
	<u>White</u>	<u>Blue</u>		
	<u>Collar</u>	<u>Collar</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Agriculture</u>
Immigrated 1975-1979	19.1	50.3	20.0	10.6
1970-1974	22.2	53.2	16.7	7.9
1960-1969	35.4	43.5	14.6	6.0
Pre-1960	34.4	42.9	15.0	7.7

Source: PRB Analysis of one-percent Public-Use Microdata Sample file.

* The occupation of those who have worked since 1975 is included.

Section 6 - Homeownership

One of the most important indicators of socioeconomic status is homeownership. For most American families, equity in a home is by far their most significant financial asset.²⁵

Homeownership also provides a measure of social status and links one to the neighborhood and community in a special way. As Table 6.1 shows, 67 percent of housing units occupied by whites in 1986 were owned, whereas around 45 percent of units occupied by blacks and 41 percent occupied by Hispanics were owner-occupied. Little change occurred between 1980 and 1986. The large increase in the price of housing has probably played a role in the lack of progress by all segments of the population. The Hispanic population is the only segment which shows any decline in home ownership, but the decline is small and probably statistically insignificant.

The percentages in Table 6.2 reflect the number of people who live in owner vs. renter occupied housing and therefore the percentages can not be directly compared to the percentages in Table 6.1, which represent the percentage of housing units occupied by owners or renters. The lowest rate of homeownership is found in the Hispanic population (43 percent) although the value is similar to that of Non-Hispanic blacks (47 percent). Among the Hispanic subgroups, the Puerto Rican population has the lowest rate of homeownership, 25 percent, while Cubans have the

25. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1986, "Household Wealth and Asset Ownership: 1984", Current Population Reports, Series P-70, No. 7, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. July

highest, 53 percent. Although the data consistently indicate that Cubans enjoy the highest socioeconomic status of all Hispanic subgroups, they still are significantly below the comparable values for Non-Hispanic whites. In this case, Cubans homeownership is still 20 percentage points below the value for Non-Hispanic whites.

Table

6.1. Percent of Housing Units Occupied by Owner or Renter, by Race and Hispanic Origin of Householder: 1980 and 1986.

		1980		1986	
		Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied
White*	67%	33%	67%	33%	
Black*	44	56	45	55	
Hispanic	43	57	41	59	

Source: 1980 data: 1980 Census of Housing, Vol. 1, Characteristics of Housing Units. Table 3.

1986 data: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1988, No. 43, Pg. 37.

* Hispanics included in category.

Table 6.2. Percent of Population Living in Owner or Renter Occupied Housing Unit, by Racial and Ethnic Group: 1988.

	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	Total Population (in 1000s)
Non-Hispanic White	74%	26%	178,102
Non-Hispanic Black	47	53	28,520
Hispanic	43	57	19,414
Mexican	48	52	12,105
Puerto Rican	25	75	2,471
Cuban	53	47	1,034
Cen/South Am.	33	67	2,242
Other	46	54	1,573

Source: Analysis of 1988 CPS March Supplement.

Section 7 - Analysis of Assimilation by Hispanics

Aside from the economic measures examined in the previous Sections, there are several indicators of assimilation that can be gleaned from available data which don't rely on socioeconomic status. In this section we will examine four such measures; language usage, residential integration, intermarriage, and fertility.

Use of Spanish Language

One sign of assimilation into mainstream American culture is the use of English as the predominant language. Information on this topic was collected in the 1980 Census.

The ability to speak English is closely tied to employment. Data from the 1980 Census show that among women those who state that they do not speak English are three times as likely to state that they have never worked (37 percent) as those who speak English very well (12 percent).

Since ability to speak English is related to employment, it is not surprising that it is also related to income. Only 12 percent of those who speak English very well are below the poverty level, whereas over 34 percent of those who do not speak English at all are under the poverty line.

Data shown in Table 7.1 indicate that 6 percent of U.S. Hispanics between the ages of 5 and 64 did not speak English at all in 1980. About a quarter (23 percent) of U.S. Hispanics age 5 to 64, say that they speak only English, and another 37 percent

say they speak English very well.

Even though Cubans have higher socioeconomic characteristics than other Hispanic subgroups, there is a high percentage of Cubans who indicate that they don't speak English. More than one out of five Cubans (22 percent) say that they don't speak English. Among Puerto Ricans only 8 percent say they don't speak English and among Mexican-Americans about 11 percent say that they don't speak English. The high rate of non English-speaking Cubans may be due in part to the influx of Cubans in the Mariel Boatlift just before the 1980 Census, and also due in part to the very large Cuban community in Miami, which reduces the need to learn English.

Data from the 1980 Census indicate that 32 percent of native-born Hispanics speak only English compared to 4 percent of foreign-born Hispanics (Table 7.2). At the other end of the spectrum, 17 percent of foreign-born Hispanics do not speak English at all, while only 2 percent of the Hispanics born in this country indicate that they don't speak English at all.

It appears that over time most Hispanic immigrants adopt English as their main language. One study found that three-quarters of Hispanic immigrants speak English on a daily basis by the time they have been in the country for 15 years and more than half the immigrants who arrived in the United States before they were age 14 have made English their everyday language²⁶.

26. Valdivieso, Rafael, and Cary Davis, 1988, U.S. Hispanics: Challenging Issues for the 1990s, Population Trends and Public Policy, Population Reference Bureau,

Among Hispanic immigrants who arrive prior to 1960, about 8 percent reported in 1980 that they did not speak English at all, but among those who arrived between 1975 and 1980, 28 percent reported not speaking English at all. According to the 1980 Census almost two-thirds (64 percent) of Hispanic immigrants who arrive prior to 1950 said they speak English well or very well. Among Hispanic immigrants who arrived between 1975 and 1980, only 37 percent said they spoke English well or very well.

Intermarriage

One key indicator of social assimilation of a group is the extent to which members of the group are likely to marry persons from other racial or ethnic groups. This type of information has been reported yearly by the Census Bureau for blacks and Hispanics since 1980.

Table 7.3 shows that about one out of every six (16.4 percent) married Hispanics had a spouse who was not Hispanic in 1987. This proportion has remained stable since 1981,²⁷ but due to the significant growth in the Hispanic population during the 1980s, the number of Hispanics married to a Non-Hispanic has increased steadily from 869,000 in 1981 to 1,091,000 in 1987: a 26 percent increase.

Washington, D.C.

27. In 1980 the percentage of Hispanics with a nonhispanic spouse was significantly higher than 1981 and subsequent years. Since 1980 was the first year this tabulation appeared we suspect that the 1980 figure is not reliable.

26 percent increase.

Hispanic women were slightly more likely to be married to a Non-Hispanic spouse than were Hispanic men (15 percent of Hispanic men compared to 18 percent of Hispanic women were married to a nonHispanic spouse.).

In order to put intermarriage figures in perspective it should be noted that the rate of intermarriage among hispanics was several times that of blacks. In 1987, only 2.9 percent of married blacks had a spouse who was not black. The figure for blacks has not changed during the 1980s.

Residential Integration

Another key measure of assimilation is the extent to which a group is scattered across residential areas or isolated in certain neighborhoods. Indicators of residential integration measure how well one group is interspersed with other groups.

One major pattern of population change during the 20th century has been the movement of whites out of central cities into the adjacent suburbs. Nearly half (49.8 percent) of all whites now live in the suburbs and only about one-quarter (26.8 percent) live in central cities.²⁸ This suburban movement has been associated with upward mobility, since aggregate statistics show that those who move from central city to suburb are better off than those who stay behind.

The process of suburbanization can best be examined by

²⁸. U.S. Bureau of the Census

looking at only those people living metropolitan areas. It is worth noting that the U.S. Hispanic population is more highly clustered in metro areas than either the white or the black population. In 1988, only 7.4 percent of Hispanics resided outside of a metro area, compared to 17.7 percent of blacks and 23.4 percent of whites²⁹.

The distribution of Hispanics within metro areas contrasts sharply with that of whites. The most recent data, which reflects patterns as of March 1988, are shown in Table 7.4. Over half of all Hispanics (58 percent) live in Central Cities and 42 percent reside in suburbs. On the other hand, almost two-thirds (65 percent) of whites residing in metro areas live in the suburbs. This suggests that Hispanics trail far behind whites in the process of suburbanization. On the other hand, Hispanic suburbanization appears to be more advanced than that of blacks. Only 31 percent of metro area Blacks reside in suburban areas.

Some of the racial and ethnic differences may be due to regional distribution of groups. For example, blacks are more likely to live in the large cities of the Northeast and Midwest where central cities are more dominant, while Hispanics are clustered in the sunbelt where suburban growth has been a more prominent aspect of urban development.

The level of suburbanization of Hispanics varies dramatically among metro areas. For example, in Miami and San

29. U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1988, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 161, Table 18, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Francisco two-thirds of the Hispanics in the standard metropolitan area lived in the suburbs, but in the New York metro area only 6 percent lived in the suburbs in 1980³⁰.

Furthermore, the level of Hispanic suburbanization in a metro area appears to be closely associated with the level of socioeconomic status of the Hispanic community. Metro areas where Hispanics have higher levels of income tend to be ones where there is more Hispanics suburbanization.

Massey and Denton also found that residential segregation of Hispanics increased during the 1970s in those metro areas which experienced rapid immigration.³¹ Since Hispanic immigrants were likely to be poorer than other Hispanics this corroborates the link between low socioeconomic status and residential segregation.

In the most comprehensive article yet on residential segregation based on the 1980 census data, Massey and Denton³², concluded "Hispanic segregation was markedly below that of blacks, but increased substantially in some urban areas that experienced Hispanic immigration and population growth over the

30. Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy Denton, 1988, "Suburbanization and Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 94, No. 3, (pp 592-626), November

31. Massey, D. and Denton, N., November 1988, "Suburbanization and Segregation in the U.S. Metropolitan Areas", in American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 94, No. 3, (pp 592-626).

32. Massey, Douglas and Nancy Denton, 1987, "Trends in the Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians: 1970 to 1980," American Sociological Review, Vol. 52, December, (pp 802-825)

decade."

The index of dissimilarity is probably the most well-known measure of segregation. This measure indicates the degree to which groups are distributed evenly among neighborhoods, typically census tracts or blocks, in a city. An index score of 0 reflects no residential segregation, and an index score of 1 indicates complete residential segregation of groups.

Data in Table 7.5 show that the dissimilarity of population distribution across neighborhoods between whites (anglos) and Hispanics is much less severe than the dissimilarity between whites (anglos) and blacks. However, during the 1970s, the extent of dissimilarity declined for both blacks and Asians, but not for Hispanics. The index of dissimilarity for Hispanics in 1980 was .43, virtually unchanged from 1970 when it was .44. While the index of dissimilarity was much higher for blacks at both points in time, the index fell from .79 to .69 between 1970 and 1980. The index also fell for Asians; from .44 in 1970 to .34 in 1980.

Another way of gauging residential segregation is to look at the likelihood of contact between groups. Across the 60 major cities studied by Massey and Denton, Hispanics were about twice as likely as blacks to share a neighborhood with anglos in 1980, although the probability of Hispanics sharing a neighborhood with anglos was slightly lower in 1980 (.71) than in 1970 (.64) (see Table 7.6). Hispanics were slightly less likely than Asians to share a neighborhoods with Anglos in 1970.

Another area closely related to residential segregation is the segregation of Hispanics within public schools. Since most schools draw students from nearby residential areas, residential segregation usually leads to segregation within schools. Orfield³³, found that the share of Hispanic students attending a school where minorities comprised the majority of the student body rose steadily from 54.8 percent in 1968 to 68.1 percent in 1980. In the same study, he found that the percent of Hispanic students attending a school where minorities made up more than 90 percent of the study body grew from 23.1 percent in 1968 to 28.8 percent in 1980. While the 1980 figures are higher for Blacks, the trend over the 1968 to 1980 period was in the opposite direction

Fertility

The extent to which a group adopts the childbearing norms of the dominant culture is often used as a reflection of assimilation and acculturation. While there is a long history of fertility differences between minority groups and the majority anglo population there is a divergence of opinion on the reasons for the difference. One group of researchers argues that minorities typically have a set of characteristics (poor education, low income, etc) which determine their fertility. Another group acknowledges the importance of socioeconomic

³³. Orfield, Gary, 1983, Public School Desegregation in the United States, 1968-1980, Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, D.C.

characteristics but feel that "minority status" exerts an independent effect on fertility. Table 7.7 shows that childbearing experience of Hispanics and Anglos (nonHispanic whites) as reflected in the 1980 Census. Among women near the end of their childbearing years (aged 35 to 44), Hispanics have a fertility level that is 27 percent higher than that of Anglo women. Among the Hispanic subgroups, Mexican-Americans have the highest fertility level, about 45 percent higher than that of Anglos. Cubans actually have a lower level of fertility than Anglo women.

The fertility of experiences of Anglo and Hispanic women in the 15 to 24 year old age group are more divergent than those in the 35 to 44 year old group. Among Hispanic women age 15 to 24 in 1980, there were 475 births for every 1000 women, compared to 262 for Anglo women.

Among women just entering their childbearing years (18 to 24 years olds) in 1987, white and Hispanic women had lifetime birth expectations that are very similar. White women in this age group expected about 2.1 children while Hispanic women expected to have 2.2 children (see Table 7.8). This suggests that young Hispanic women are adopting the family size norms of the Anglo culture.

Data also indicate that young Hispanic women have fertility expectations closer to their Anglo counterparts than do Hispanic women in their 30s. Among women in the 30 to 34 year old age range, Hispanic women expect to have 2.6 children by the time

they complete their childbearing while white women in this age group expect to have only 2.0 children in their completed family (see Table 7.8).

While the fertility expectations of Anglo and Hispanic women are very similar, fertility behavior of young anglo and Hispanic women are quite different. For every 1000 women in the 18 to 24 year old age group in 1987, Hispanics had already had 876 births compared to only 457 for white women.

The early timing of births among Hispanic women relative to anglo women are probably related to their higher overall fertility and to the higher birth expectations later in life. It is clear that native born Hispanic women have fertility experiences closer to that of white women than do foreign born Hispanic women. Bean and Tienda show that Non-Hispanic white women age 15 to 44 have had an average of 1.83 children, which is lower than all major Hispanic groups with the exception of second and later generation Cubans with an average of only .67.³⁴ Among all Hispanic subgroups, fertility is higher among first generation immigrants than among native born Hispanics.

The Total Fertility Rate (average lifetime births per woman) for foreign-born Hispanics in 1980 was 2.9, which is slightly more than one child greater than the rate of 1.8 for non-Hispanics. The higher fertility of Hispanic immigrants probably reflects the larger family size norms of their native countries.

³⁴. Bean, F. and Tienda, M., 1987, "The Hispanic Population of the United States", NY, Russell Sage Foundation: Table 7.4.

On the other hand, the fertility of American-born Hispanics (2.4 children) was significantly less than Hispanics immigrants. This suggests that a large share of American-born Hispanics have adopted U.S. family size norms³⁵.

It appears that young Hispanic women have adopted the family size norms of anglo women, but have not adopted all of the behavioral norms that help anglo women better realize their desired family size.

35. Valdivieso, Rafael, and Cary Davis, 1988, U.S. Hispanics: Challenging issues for the 1990s, Population Trends and Public Policy, No. 17, December, Population Reference Bureau, Washington, D.C.

Table 7.1. English Language Speaking Ability of the Hispanic Origin Population, Aged 25 and Over, 1980

	All* Hispanics	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central/South American	Other Hispanic
English Only	23%	14%	9%	6%	6%	39%
Very Well	37	37	37	24	26	34
Well	21	22	27	23	29	16
Not Well	13	16	19	25	25	8
Not at All	6	11	8	22	14	4

Source: 1980 Census Public Use Microdata Sample
(Bean and Tienda, 1988)

*PRB analysis of Public-Use Microdata Sample of Hispanics aged 5 to 64.

Table 7.2. English Language Speaking Ability of U.S. Population of Hispanic Origin, Ages 5 to 64 years, by Period of Immigration: 1980.

	Speaking Ability				
	not at all	not well	well	very well	English only
Total Hispanic	6%	13%	21%	37%	23%
Native-Born	2	7	19	41	32
Foreign Born	17	26	26	27	4
Immigrated					
1975-80	28	32	22	15	3
1970-74	16	27	29	25	3
1965-69	12	24	28	33	4
1960-64	8	20	26	42	5
pre-1959	8	18	26	38	10

Source: PRB Analysis of 1980 Census Public-Use Microdata Sample file.

Table 7.3 Intermarriage of Hispanics in 1981 to 1987

	<u>Number of Married Hispanics (in 1000s)</u>	<u>Number of Hispanics With Non-Hispanic Spouse (in 1000s)</u>	<u>Percent of Hispanics With a Non-Hispanic Spouse</u>
1981	4,932	869	17.6
1982	5,112	882	17.3
1983	5,224	842	16.1
1984	5,524	848	15.4
1985	6,035	979	16.2
1986	6,286	1,064	16.9
1987	6,663	1,091	16.4

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Series P-20, No. 366, 371, 381, 388, 398, 411, 419, and 424

Table 7.4. Distribution of Hispanics, Whites and Blacks Across Central Cities and Suburbs: 1988

	<u>Hispanics*</u>		<u>Whites</u>		<u>Blacks</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Central Cities	10,431	58	54,503	35	16,728	69
Suburbs**	<u>7,530</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>101,512</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>7,356</u>	<u>31</u>
Total	17,961	100	156,015	100	24,084	100

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988, Series P-60, No. 161, Table 18

* Hispanics are also included in the figures for blacks and whites

** The area inside metropolitan areas but outside of central cities.

Table 7.5. Residential Segregation of Hispanics, Blacks and Asians in 1970 and 1980 in 60 Major Metro Areas.

<u>Dissimilarity of residential locations between Anglos and:</u>					
<u>Blacks</u>		<u>Hispanics</u>		<u>Asians</u>	
<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>
.79	.69	.44	.43	.44	.34

Source: Taken from Massey and Denton, 1987, Tables 1 and 3.

Table 7.6. Residential Segregation of Hispanics, Anglos, Blacks and Asians in 1970 and 1980 in 60 Major Metro Areas.

	Group's Probability of Contact with:							
	Anglos		Blacks		Hispanics		Asians	
	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>
Anglo	.88	.85	.04	.05	.07	.08	.01	.02
Black	.33	. 8	.55	.49	.10	.11	.01	.03
Hispanic	.71	.64	.11	.13	.17	.20	.01	.03
Asian	.76	.75	.10	.10	.11	.11	.03	.05

Source: Taken from Massey and Denton, 1987, Tables 1 and 3.

Table 7.7. Children Ever Born per 1000 Women: 1980

	Non-Hispanic	Hispanics				
	Whites (Anglos)	Total	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Other Spanish
Women Aged 15 to 24	262	475	528	548	192	337
Women Aged 25 to 34	1383	1922	2105	1986	1189	1567
Women Aged 35 to 44	2523	3202	3646	3202	2033	2640

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983, 1980 Census of Population, PC80-1-C1, "General Social and Economic Characteristics: United States Summary," Table 166

Table 7.8. Births and Birth Expectations for White and Hispanic Women Age 18 to 24 and 30 to 34: 1976 to 1987.

	Births and Lifetime Births Expected per 1000 Women							
	Age 18-24				Age 30-34			
	Experienced		Expected		Experienced		Expected	
	White	Hispanic	White	Hispanic	White	Hispanic	White	Hispanic
1987	455	876	2059	2196	1644	2283	2026	2595
1986	448	660	2116	2061	1683	2190	2056	2434
1985	463	785	2079	2208	1612	2242	1979	2555
1983	433	740	2098	2167	1730	2478	2031	2748
1982	398	718	2016	2053	1730	2296	2002	2562
1981	449	710	2049	2114	1797	2378	2044	2638
1980	456	782	2028	2152	1861	2476	2101	2743
1979	462	789	2034	2138	1902	2567	2126	2833
1978	443	744	2042	2195	2027	2706	2258	2953
1977	433	708	2067	2073	2088	2631	2288	2900
1976	468	751	2038	2227	2218	2944	2390	3189

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988, "Fertility of American Women: 1987", Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 427, Table 5

Most Hispanic are also included in the figures for whites.

Population Reference Bureau
777 14th St, NW
Washington DC 20005
Tel (202) 639 8040